

**REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review of the present application and requests reconsideration in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner has identified several claim objections in claims 1,2,6,7,10,13,14 and 16. All objections (with the exception of those in claim 6 which cannot be identified by Applicant) have been corrected as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 under 35 USC 102(b) over Lawrence. Applicant traverses this rejection. In making this rejection, the Examiner states that claim 1 does not positively recite a rear wall nor does it recite that the longitudinal sides of the bars for each legs directly contacts and engages with the rear wall. Claim 1 is presently amended to positively recite the rear wall AND both the contact and engagement with the rear wall as pointed out by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant urges that amended claim 1 is not anticipated nor made obvious by the Lawrence reference.

The subject matter of the invention is a corner angle piece which is suited to connect three parts of a cabinet namely the rear wall, one of the grooved side walls and a grooved board. The

purpose is to fix the rear wall in its position in which it engages into the grooves of the grooved side wall and the grooved board. The screw or the set pin which penetrates the through holes of the support elements also penetrates the rear wall and the side wall or the board on the inside of the rear wall. In this manner three elements of the cabinet are fixed together which are connected in a corner area at an angle of 90 degrees to one another.

It is of importance for the invention as claimed that the rear wall, engaging in the grooves of the sidewalls and the grooved board, is an element which stabilizes the cabinet. The corner connectors with the reference Nos. 12, 44 of Lawrence are not constructed and neither do they work in the same manner as the corner angle piece 1 according to claim 1.

Thus, Lawrence does not teach to connect the rear wall of a cabinet with a sidewall and a board of the cabinet. According to figure 10 of the Lawrence document, the corner connectors 44 interconnect a first, a second and a third frame member with one another and it is not obvious from this prior art to connect a sidewall and a board of a cabinet with the rear wall of the cabinet by use of a simple corner angle piece.


In re: Hinsberger et al.  
Filed: January 23, 2004  
Serial No.: 10/763,556  
Page 14

The same arguments apply to amended claim 13. Newly presented claim 21 is a combination of allowable claims 9, 2 and 1.

The Examiner next rejects claims 13-18 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Morris. Applicant again traverses this rejection for the same reasons set forth above.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and distinguish over the art of record. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
  
Hinsberger et al.

By   
Daniel J. Bourque, Esquire  
Registration No. 35,457  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.  
835 Hanover Street, Suite 301  
Manchester, New Hampshire 03104

Telephone: (603) 623-5111  
Facsimile: (603) 624-1432

Date: 3-22-06